



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is not liable on these facts, on the ground that the trust is created by the agreement of agency, and so is within that section of the statute of frauds requiring declarations of trust in lands to be in writing. *Burden v. Sheridan*, 33 Iowa 425; *Nestal v. Schmidt*, 29 N. J. Eq. 458. The ruling of the first case, that the trust is not within the statute, seems to be based on the better reasoning, in that agency, though created by an agreement, is properly a relation, or *status*, which, for a particular purpose, is fiduciary, and an abuse by the agent of this fiduciary relation is a fraud on his principal, and renders him liable for the proceeds of his wrongful act as a constructive trustee; and so this trust really results by operation of law, and so is not within the statute of frauds. *Winn v. Dillon*, 27 Miss. 494. There is even greater reason, in the case under discussion, for the holding that the trust is not within the statute, for, by means of the verbal agreement, the purchaser was able to obtain the property at a price below its value. Under practically the same facts the same was held in *Ryan v. Dox*, 34 N. Y. 307, and in *McNeil v. Gates*, 41 Ark. 264; and this seems to be the weight of authority on the subject.

WATERS AND WATER COURSES—PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY—WATER COMPANY—PAYMENT OF DISPUTED BILL FOR WATER.—*HATCH V. CONSUMERS CO. LTD.*, 104 PAC. 670 (IDAHO).—*Held*, that a water company cannot enforce a rule requiring a consumer to pay an old or disputed bill for water furnished him at some previous time, or for some other and independent use, or at some other place or residence, or for a separate and distinct transaction from that for which he is claiming and demanding a water supply, as a condition precedent to supplying him with water, where he tenders payment of the established water rate in advance for the service he is demanding.

It is well established that the rule allowing a water company to shut off the water supply, for the non-payment of its bills refers to current rents only, and not to rents for past service. *Merrimac River Savings Bank v. City of Lowell*, 152 Mass. 556. And similarly, a quasi-public company cannot refuse to furnish gas to a consumer, where he tenders payment of the prescribed rate in advance, because he refuses to pay a former gas bill, or a bill contracted for gas used on other premises. *Gas Light Co. of Baltimore v. Colliday*, 25 Md. 1; *Lloyd v. Washington Gas Light Co.*, 1 Mackay (D. C.) 331. But a water company may provide by its by-law that if the rent is not paid, the supply shall be cut off until all arrears, and expenses for shutting off, are paid. *Brumm v. Pottsville Water Co.*, 9 Penn. 483. And the one desiring the supply turned on must pay the arrears even though they were incurred by a former tenant. *City of Atlanta v. Burton*, 90 Ga. 486; *Girard Life Ins. Co. v. Phila.* 88 Pa. St. 393.

WITNESS—ATTORNEY AND CLIENT—PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS.—*RICHARDS V. RICHARDS*, 119 N. Y. SUPP. 81—Where a client gives his attorney notice of his place of residence it was *held*, not to affect the attorney's professional employment, and is not a "privileged communication," which the attorney cannot be compelled to disclose for the purpose of service of an order on such client.